

-- REMARKS --

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 18-22 and 26-29 were pending in the application. Claims 6-8, 15-17, 23-25 and 30-32 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 3, 20 and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 18 and 27 have been amended. The changes to the amended claims from the previous versions to the rewritten versions are shown above with brackets for deleted matter and underlines for added matter. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

In the outstanding final Office Action, claims 10-14 have been allowed. Further discussion of these claims is therefore unnecessary.

In the outstanding final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,519,465 to Triplett ("Triplett"). Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,158,535 to Porubcansky et al. ("Porubcansky") in view of Triplett. Claims 3, 20 and 29 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed. In particular, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Triplett discloses a pair of identical and interchangeable crawler assemblies as called for by independent claims 1, 18 and 27. The claims have nevertheless been amended to further clarify the claimed invention and to place the application in condition for an expeditious allowance. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of objected to claim 3, independent claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of objected to claim 20, and independent claim 27 has been amended to include the limitations of objected to claim 29. Claims 1, 18 and 27 are therefore each in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are also in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 9 are each dependent on claim 1 and are therefore patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable. Claims 19, 21 and 22 are each dependent on claim 18 and are

therefore patentable for the same reasons that claim 18 is patentable. Claim 28 is dependent on claim 27 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons that claim 27 is patentable.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance is now earnestly requested. If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4273.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Milz
Registration No. 34,880
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200